REMARKS

Claims 1-43 remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1-27

The Office Action rejected claims 36-43 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112. In particular, claims 36-43 were rejected for allegedly lack of antecedent basis for "said largest sequence number yet seen".

Claims 36-43 are amended where appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that claims 36-43 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112 and that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-43 over Hughes

In the Office Action, claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Combined DES-CBC, HMAC and Replay Prevention Security Transform* to J. Hughes ("Hughes"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-43 recite a system and method for <u>adjusting an acceptance window/replay mask</u> **based on a largest nonce value yet seen**.

Hughes appears to disclose two types of analysis for a received packet to prevent a replay attack, 1) that the received in-order packets have increasing counter values or 2) for out-of-order packets, that the received packets are received only once by checking for non-repeating counter values within a sliding window, with some allowance for repetition (See Hughes, page 3). For out-of-order packets, Hughes determines that the received out-of-order packets are received only once by checking for non-repeating counter values within a sliding window.

Hughes discloses a method of preventing a replay attack within a sliding window. However, Hughes discloses a size of the sliding window is an

implementation detail (See page 3). Thus, Hughes fails to disclose <u>HOW</u> to determine the size of a sliding window. Hughes fails to disclose or suggest <u>adjusting an acceptance window/replay mask</u> **based on a largest nonce value yet seen**, as recited by claims 1-43.

A benefit of <u>adjusting an acceptance window/replay mask</u> **based on a largest nonce value yet seen** is, e.g., reduce confusion between sessions. An acceptance window/replay mask is used to reject data associated with nonce values that are outside of an acceptable range, i.e., having a nonce values that are too big and/or too small. However it may be desirable in some instances to adjust the size of an acceptance window/replay mask, such as when starting a new session and resetting a nonce value. A previous session's large nonce value may play havoc on a new session starting with small nonce values. When switching sessions to restrict acceptance of a previous session's large nonce values it is desirable to narrow an acceptance window/replay mask. However, once a session is underway it is desirable to broaden an acceptance window/replay mask to prevent unnecessary rejection of data associated with nonce values. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-43 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-43 over Schneier

In the Office Action, claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,970,143 to Schneier et al. ("Schneier"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-43 recite a system and method for <u>adjusting an acceptance window/replay mask</u> **based on a largest nonce value yet seen**.

The Examiner alleges that Schneier discloses adjusting an acceptance window based on a nonce value exceeding a largest nonce value yet

seen, with the acceptance window being a log of nonce values which have been received within a prescribed amount of time (See Office Action, page 6).

Thus, the Examiner acknowledges that Schneier discloses adjusting a log of nonce values which have been received within a prescribed amount of time, i.e., based on **time** NOT based on a **largest nonce value yet seen**, i.e., fails to disclose or suggest a system and method for <u>adjusting an acceptance window/replay mask</u> **based on a largest nonce value yet seen**, as recited by claims 1-43.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-43 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df